DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 163 126 UD 018 832

AUTHOR Hilliard, Asa G., III
TITLE Anatomy and Dynamics of Oppression.
PUB DATE 20 Jun 78
NOTE 26p.; Address delivered at the National Conference on Human Relations in Education (1st, Minneapolis, Minnesota, June 20, 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Black History; *Colonialism; *Educational Discrimination; Educational Quality; *Human Relations; Quality of Life; *Racial Discrimination; *Racism

ABSTRACT

Education has traditionally been a tool of colonialists, who used it to destroy peoples' cultural histories and to create new cultural myths (such as race) designed to divide, demean, and debilitate the colonized group. Many concepts passed on through the educational system and through language have contributed to a form of cultural mental illness in which the objective realities of history and biology are distorted by the colonists' biases. Human relations educators must select strategies based on the theory of oppression to direct their work towards causes, not symptoms. In order to provide quality education, they should not feel bound to ethnically prejudicial testing, but should concentrate on: (1) teaching the truth (not the myth); (2) stressing historical continuity; (3) fostering self-determination and self-knowledge; and (4) instilling the spirit of liberation, which is the knowledge and capacity to choose and create. (Author/WI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

JAN 4 79

An Address Delivered at the First National Conference on
Human Relations in Education
June 20, 1978, Minneapolis, MN.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Anatomy and Dynamics of Oppression

Dr. Asa G. Hilliard, III

(Transcript of oral presentation)

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Asa Hilliard
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

ED163126

Introduction by Maxine Nathanson:

I am the Executive Director of the Minneapolis Citizens Committee on Public Education. For those of you who are visitors to Minneapolis, our organization has been in existence for 44 years. We just had our annual meeting and it is indeed a pleasure for me to be a part of this conference. I have the real pleasure today to introduce a man who graduated from the University of Denver in 1955 with his baccalaureate degree in psychology. In 1961, he received his Masters Degree in Counseling, and in 1963, he received a Doctorate of Education Degree in Educational Psychology. He has served as a public school teacher in Denver at the junior and senior high levels in mathematics, social science, American history and psychology, and in a private school at the elementary level. He has taught at the University of Denver in teacher education and in the undergraduate honors program in philosophy. In 1963, he joined the faculty at San Francisco State University in the Department of Secondary Education as an assistant professor. He served as education advisor to the Peace Corps in Liberia from 1964 to 1966. Following that assignment he joined San Francisco State University's contact team as an advisor to the Monrovia Consolidated School System in Counseling from 1966 to 1968. Upon his completion of his assignment in Liberia he was awarded a decoration by the President of the Republic of Liberia for his service to education at the local and the national levels. He returned to San Francisco as professor and chairman of the Department of Secondary Education in 1970 and in 1972, he became the Dean of the School of Education, a position he holds at the present time. He is active as a senior researcher dealing with problems in teaching and in learning. He has over 50 publications in such areas as testing and assessment, Afro American child development, curriculum, teacher education, and Afro American history. He has lectured extensively throughout most of the United States and in Africa and in Europe. His area of specialization includes assessment, Afro American history, and culture, behavioral style and learning, teacher effectiveness and the design and evaluation of education programs. It is indeed a pleasure for me to introduce to you Dr. Asa G. Hilliard, III.

UD 018832

I always like to have some common ground in sharing topics like the one I'm sharing today. So if I can test your patience a little bit, I would like to read a few things to you, each of which is an example of some of the real problems that we face in education and in the world. I won't make immediate comment about those examples, but my whole talk will be relevant to them. I'm not just citing them for impact, for they do have a very practical relationship to what I'd like to share.

One of the interesting things about the examples is that, with one exception, all were collected out of the newspapers over the last year. We're talking about now, not 10 years ago or 20 years ago, but now. The one exception is an example that I will take out of a book called The Legacy of Malthus and there is a short quote that I'll give you there and then you can make sense out of the rest of what I want to say.

The first is an article from The New York Times, April 6, 1978. It is a report of a television program on a white South African family where the young girl, as she grew up, became increasingly negroid in her appearance. As a consequence, she was put out of school. The reporter did a story on her which was shown on national television.

> "Sandra Lang was born 22 years ago to a staunch Africana family, Abraham and Sandy Lang, white shop keepers in a remote rural area. At the age of 7 she was sent away to school in a small town in South Africa. Education for white children in the strict Africana tradition was seven periods of religious worship a day. The film shows a recent class in geography at this school learning exactly the same lesson from exactly the same text that Sandra Lang had learned years before Its a lesson about race. The teacher speaks in Afrikaans. Her words are translated for the film. "What does our skin look like? What color is it?" The children answer, "A light skin". The teacher, "And our eyes? What are they like?" "White lips." "Yes, they are not so thick are they?" And now the Black people. "Their hair is crinkly and their noses are flat", and the children answer, "They are flat." "What are their mouths like?" "Their lips?" "Thick lips." Where do these Black people work?" "On the farm." "What do they plant?" "Mealies". "With their animals?" "Yes."

"But Sandra Lang, the daughter of Africans, had the features of what South Africa calls a colored person, light brown skin, broadening nose, etc. She was evidently a genetic throwback as her mother said at the time. 'If there is Black blood in our veins, this could happen to many South African families.' Because of the way she looked, parents and teachers asked the school committee to expel Sandra Lang. The committee referred her case to the Department of the Interior. After due consideration, the Department declared her colored. Three years after she entered the school, Sandra Lang was expelled. She remembers that day. The principal of the hostel, Dr. Divantunder, drove her home. A long trip. "I asked him why he was taking me away from school. But he never answered."

"The tyranny in South Africa has a particularly terrible quality as this film shows. It is not some passing times paranoia. It is methodical, ideological, permanent, an essential element in the way the whole society is organized and it is racial. Most of all we must remember the cost of deliberate official pervasive racism taught by the state curriculum in the school. It is so easy for people to deceive themselves as the Germans learned, or simply to close their eyes to the horror when an innocent child asks why she is being punished. The teacher is afraid to face the cruel truth--race, and simply does not answer."

The next article is from the San Francisco Chronicle, April 17, 1978. Title--"Anti Black Bias and Housing: A News Survey". Note that this is after the passage of housing laws that protect the right of each citizen to purchase or rent any place they choose so long as their money will carry them there. And so with that law in effect, "Blacks trying to rent houses or apartments encounter discrimination by rental agents three out of four times according to a news study commissioned by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The study also showed that Blacks trying to buy homes faced discrimination by real estate agents 62% of the time in 1978."

Next, Queens, New York, April 6, 1978, New York Times. "Earlier this year Queens, New York Board 26 rejected the program which would have provided part-time and summer jobs in Alley Park in Eastern Queens for about 50 disadvantaged youngsters. In

rejecting that, the Board sent a letter to President Carter explaining that there were no provisions for youngsters from the hard pressed middle class. The Board members told the President that they were in the forefront of a middle class revolt against special treatments for the disadvantaged and minorities."

Next, San Francisco Chronicle, (I'm sorry I don't have the date on this) title of the article, "Black Teachers Being Driven Out of the South".

> "When the Supreme Court ruled recently that South Carolina's public education system may use standardized tests to hire teachers and set their salaries, the teaching community here was predictably dismayed. There is considerable evidence already that the imposition of the National Teachers Examination has curtailed the number of Black teachers in South Carolina. In 1953, 43% of the state's teachers were Black, by 1973, the figure had dropped to 29%. According to studies of the impact of continued use of the National Teachers Examination, the studies indicated that 83% of all Black applicants would be rejected if those scores were used as a means for selection."

It happens also, by the way, that in California Blacks and Chicanos do not pass the National Teacher Examination. It also happens that the National Teacher Examination has nothing at all to do with successful teaching. Here is a discriminatory professional examination which has no demonstrated content validity.

Finally, <u>The Legacy of Malthus</u> gives us a sense of history. This book is about scientific racism, and the founding fathers of scientific racism. Thomas Malthus, now though most of us know Malthus, the part we are taught about Malthus is that he said "population increases geometrically and the food supply increases arithmetically". We pass on a school test by giving that answer. But here is the part we were not taught about Malthus.

> "The first professor of political economy in British University history spelled out the purpose of that field in the sixth edition of his famous essay on the principle of population saying, "we are bound in justice and honor formerly to disclaim the right of the poor to support. To this end I should propose a regulation to be made declaring that no child born

> from any marriage taking place after the expiration of a year from the date of the law and no illegitimate child born two years from the same date should ever be entitled to parrish assistance. The infant is comparatively speaking with little value to society as others will immediately supply its place. All children born beyond what would be required to keep up the population to this desired level must necessarily perish unless room be made for them by the deaths of grown persons." Therefore, Malthus concluded "we should facilitate instead of foolishly and vainly endeavoring to impede the operation of nature in producing this mortality. If we dread the too frequent visit of the horrid form of famine, we should encourage the other forms of destruction which we compel nature to use. Instead of recommending cleanliness to the poor, we should encourage contrary habits. In our towns we should make the streets narrower, crowd more people into the houses, court the return of the plague. In the country, we should build our villages near stagnant pools and particularly encourage settlements in all marshy and unwholesome situations, but above all, we should reprobate specific remedies for ravaging diseases and those benevolent but mistaken men who have thought they were doing a service to mankind by projecting a scheme for the total expiration of particular disorders." (Chase, 1977)

Now the only problem with that view from Malthus is that it happened also to be the view of many of the people who founded and developed the fields of psychology, sociology, anthropology and other areas from whom I could take almost exactly the same kinds of quotes.

<u>Anatomy and dynamics of oppression: The educators response</u>. I have approximately five parts to this presentation. The last two parts will be focused on the practical aspects of what we do, but I think the first three parts have to be devoted to an attempt to understand the total pattern, not so much <u>that</u> discrimination, segregation, and oppression occur in various forms as <u>how</u> they occur and <u>why</u> they occur. We generally proceed in our work without answering or even asking any of these questions. For the most part, we simply try to attack the symptoms. We do not attempt to attack the causes. Needed is a place to stand, a framework. <u>Present "human relations" theory, "multi-cultural" theory, "cultural pluralism" theory, "bilingual theory", "race relations" theory, "cultural deprivation" theory and all the new ones that will be named in the years ahead are devoid of a theory of the origins of oppression</u>. That's the first problem.

Secondly, because the origins of oppression are seldom explored and occasionally we don't even agree that oppression is a problem in our nation, the mechanics of oppression remain unknown, unstudied, and misunderstood. The "how it happens" remains unknown. The role that education plays under conditions of oppression is unique and actually is easily describable if contrasted with education which occurs under conditions of freedom and liberation. If systematic attention is not given to a study of causes and origins and then to mechanics of oppression, we would be much better off without professional study. Our condition may be compared to the old adage, "if you don't know where you're going any road will take you there." And I think that actually describes our practice in "human relations". Almost anything can be thought of as "medicine" for human relations problems.

We also have a lack of an historical perspective on oppression and because of that, we pay a terrible cost in malpractice. For example, there are studies that could be made of how education functions under oppressive systems and a few have been made. But that generally is not a part of what we look at when we begin to do our work. A systematic study of the history of education under colonization, however, will provide us with what I believe to be a useful model for examining education and oppression. You see I don't think we have a theoretical map of what takes place. I think that we could have that map if we spent time looking at what happens under conditions of oppression, especially conditions of extreme oppression. So we may think of oppression as existing in high intensity systems, that is to say clear cut overt conscious oppression such as in the case of Rhodesia, such as in the case of South Africa, such as in the case of the United States before 1954, and particularly in the years of Jim Crow and slavery, such as in Mexico under Cortez, such as, such as, such as . . . You take the ball and run with it. Those will be high intensity systems--conscious oppression. Then again you can have oppression existing in a low intensity system. What I mean by that is where the actual overt forms of oppression have been mitigated to some extent, but in reality, they've simply had their names changed. They've been covered over and called something else or hidden. They become hard to see. I think that describes the system that we happen to be living in right now. And then I guess you could say there could be a no intensity system. That would be when my model doesn't work anymore. So, I think we need a model for examining some of those things. Now, if you believe that I'm simply dealing in isolation on this, I'd like to point out that there have been people who have spent a great deal of their time looking at precisely what I'm talking about. I'd like to share the names of some of those people with you.

I would like to mention first, for example, the work of Frantz Fanon. There are two publications in particular, one Black Skins, White Masks, the second, A Dying Colonialism. Frantz Fanon, in working on the problem of oppression as a psychiatrist in Algeria when France was trying to dominate Algerian people, looked analytically at the roles that were played by colonizers and the roles that were played by people who were being colonized and found that there were consistent forms of behavior among them. That particular book, A Dying Colonialism as well as Black Skins, White Masks tend to focus primarily on the anatomy and dynamics of oppression as applied to the victims of oppression, but both together, they tend to be extremely well done with specific examples growing out of a clinical practice in an oppressive environment. We have very little other than the work of some of these people to go on in doing that kind of analysis.

Almost at the same time but a little bit later, Albert Memmi wrote a book called the Colonizer and the Colonized. He looks both at the person who benefits from a colonial system and the person who fails to benefit or who is victimized by the colonial system and comes up with almost the identical observations about the way in which the system works on both groups of people. Cheik Diop has recently had his book republished. It was first published in French. It was not acceptable initially as a doctoral dissertation. He had to fight to get it put through because he was too creative (as is the case with many doctoral students). He also wrote a book that he called The Cultural Unity of Black Africa. This book has just been reprinted by Third World Press in Chicago. The importance of it is that it destroys the myths that were created as an aspect of the dynamics of oppression in Africa. In other words, for example, in order to dominate Africa it became necessary for scholars to produce an image of Africa as "divided among many peoples". By using that idea, Europeans were able to divide and conquer. It becomes very important for human relations workers, if you intend to understand the dynamics of oppression, to see how it has worked in a number of places where people such as Diop has examined it.

I also have brought with me a book by three people, John Hodges, Donald Struckman, and Linda Trost titled The Cultural Basis of Racism and Group Oppression: An Examination of Traditional Western Concepts, Values, and Institutional Structures Which Support Racism, Sexism, and Elitism. This book is an analysis of some of the assumptions that we hold that will guarantee that we participate, knowingly or unknowingly, in oppressive actions. I read to you in the earlier examples from a book by Allan Chase called The Legacy of Malthus. Almost everything in it is as important as the kind of thing that I read before, because it documents the roles that people have played and it describes how these roles have been

played out in producing this system of oppression.

In 1947, there was another book written by Weinreich called Hitler's Professors: The role that scholarship played in Germany's crimes against the Jewish people. The importance of this book was that it described that period in time in which, if anything, scholarship did not follow Hitler but almost lead him. In other words, we always blame the "rednecks". Someone has to write the book--"the scholar as 'redneck'--because the people who were supposed to be the rednecks were only following "scholarly orders". Some of the best people, the equivalent of our Nobel Prize winners; some of the best schools; some of the best departments; some of the outstanding professional associations, willingly offered their services and said, "What possibly can we do to make geography a servant of the Reich?" "What can we do to make psychology a servant of the Reich?" "What can we do to make each of these disciplines a servant of the Reich?" And, of course they did. Biologists, for example, came up with descriptions of "race". Anthropologists came up with hierarchies of culture, etc. All of those things were turned against the populations to be dominated. By merely running some of the kinds of human relations workshops that we run, we would not have solved the problems which I gave as earlier examples.

Finally, Kenneth King has done a book called PanAfricanism and Education. I usually mention that book because it documents the fact that many of the things that happen are not accidental. Most of our assumptions about the "human Relations" problem seem to me to indicate that we think that they "just growed". In some cases that is true. But, in fact, there are also people who are game makers and game designers. Its important that we know that. This book "PanAfricanism in Education" by Kenneth King, for example, explains the work of a man named Thomas Jesse Jones who began in 1910 to be an expert on Black people. Booker T. Washington requested Jones to do a study of Black schools, particularly Black independent schools. He did that and concluded that the independent Black schools were unqualified and, therefore, should be stamped out. He became very famous and for 30 years was in control of almost anything that happened in Black education in America and in Africa with the help of E. K. Oldham from England and C. T. Loram of South Africa. Here were three countries cooperating together to design specifically the content, methods, practice, aims, outcomes of education for Black people. He also became so influential that philanthropists would come to him for recommendations about which institutions to support. He also was advisory to many missionary societies in such things as whether or not they should send Black people to Africa as missionaries; which Africans should come to America; which schools they should go to, and what should be in their packet of books. And, of course, Booker T. Washington's Up From Slavery was in the packet, not Dubois' work, not Garvey's work.

So, colonization and education is a neglected area of study. Its not that there aren't things that are available for study and that need to be studied. If we did this study, here are some of the things I think we would discover. First, any time one group of people, wherever that is, decides to dominate another group of people, wherever that is, certain things have to happen. The people who are going to be colonized or oppressed have to be marked in some way. And that way is always arbitrary. Now in the case of some countries, that may be color; in other countries, it may be religion; in other countries, it may be language. There has to be a marker that separates those who are supposed to get the goodies from those who are supposed to get "the treatment". That marker is arbitrary, initially. Once the marker is established, then the mark that has been picked has to be stigmatized. And this is where scholarship comes in, both in helping us to pick the marker (in Hitler's Germany we began to get "Jewish genes"), and then these have to be stigmatized. Its not enough simply to separate people into groups, but you must also make sure that the marked group has negative qualities. So you need scholarship and research to make that happen and to make the prejudice credable.

Next is cultural destruction in order to make everyone behave. In every country in which one group of people tries to control another group of people, the first order of control is to destroy the history and culture of the people to be dominated. Because without that destruction we have evidence that people are able to resist oppression. So that becomes very important to those who would dominate.

Next, people have to be removed from history, actually to be taken out of history. One of the interesting things about Blacks in America is that's exactly what happened and it couldn't have happened if we had known true history. It couldn't have happened if you had known, for example, that long before the explorers or colonists ever got to the continent of Africa, civilizations existed there. Long before colonizers ever got there, universities existed there. When I was young, Timbuktu was taught as a stigmatized name. "You're from Timbuktu". It was one of the most famous seats of learning in the ancient world. People came from all over the world, some of the greatest scholars in the world, taught in Timbuktu, thats in the empire of Mali--in West Africa. Thats the place where later, scholars would say it was occupied by people who had tails. Even though they knew better or, if they were qualified scholars, should have known better.

Next, the colonized had to become plural. You must make the group to be dominated a "they", one large group--not individuals. Next, leadership has to be destabilized continually. In other words, no one can become an independent leader of the group to be dominated. It always has to be destabilized and one of the ways of doing that,

by the way, is for the colonizers to select leaders for the people to be dominated. And one of the tests of colonization, for example, is whether or not the people who are projected as leaders of the people have the grassroots support of the people to be dominated, or whether they are media created, or politically appointed by outsiders. Liberty has to be removed and that can happen in a number of ways. Initially, that happens simply by locking people up in a concentration camp. After that it's important that the mind is so educated that people will lock themselves up. And that has happened quite a bit.

Next, new myths have to be supplied which build the image of the colonizer and which build the negative image of the people to be dominated. You need scholarship to do that. The colonizer has to be projected as powerful, good, supreme, whereas the colonized has to be projected as negative--never had anything, never did anything, etc. I wish I had before me all the different ways and different times in which this is done so that you would know that this is simply not just a generalization.

Next, and especially important, are the games with names and the games with language. Names are changed for very very important reasons. For example, "Negro", "West Indian", "African", especially "West African" are the same people. They are identical people. "Negroes" came basically from West Africa and so did the West Indians. But, if they call themselves and learn to think of themselves and other people think of them as three separate people, then the opportunity for collaborative effort is destroyed. So this is the reason that naming becomes a very important point. We don't have many studies of the impact of names and yet names have been used by colonizers for 400 years very carefully as a way of encouraging domination. For example, once you name an island group "Micronesia", then suddenly you include under the same umbrella groups of people who may not even be culturally similar, just as you can exclude people who are culturally similar. You may include people who are not and, therefore, make it very difficult for them to collaborate. When Alexander the Great took over a city in Africa he changed the name to "Alexandria". When Constantine took over Istanbul, it became "Constantinople". Whats in a name? A whole lot's in a name. It tells you an awful lot about a people. Names are one of the main vehicles for colonization. That's the reason that at the individual level its always important to change the names of the people as well as to change the names of their nation. They become disassociated from the cultural past which sustains them.

<u>Education, special and deliberate, is necessary for each one of these things that I've been talking about to occur</u>. In other words, they don't just occur by accident, this gets at the anatomy and dynamics

that I was talking about. Also euphemisms must now become a means of escape from truth and responsibility. You have problems not only with the colonized behaving, but colonizers don't always want to behave either. Some people want to backslide on the issue. So one way that you keep the troops in line (to make the oppressive system keep going) is to use euphemisms so that people feel that they are doing something when they're not.

And so our field of "human relations", particularly, is full of euphemisms. We cannot call things as they are very often. The first reason is that it's very painful to say some of the things that we have to say. It's not easy to say "racist", it's not easy to say "oppression". We have other names for that. It's not easy to say "Black", so we'll say "inner city". We'll say "human relations", we'll say "multicultural education", we'll say "bilingual education" when in fact we mean something quite different. The only problem with that is once we begin to do that, then we apply the euphemism and its logic to the problem that we're solving and we get all kinds of confusion. For example, if the problem in Texas is that Chicano children have been oppressed to the point that they have not received the education that they need (but we can't say that because if we start calling the problem by name then it brings up too many bad memories), so we say our problem is one of "bilingual education". Then all of a sudden you get a new group of people who come in from Europe who also are bilingual. They share bilinguality with Chicanos. They do not share race oppression or color oppression. They do share bilinguality but since color oppression is not in the title "bilingual", we quit looking at cultural oppression and we begin to look at bilinguality. Therefore, by that logic we have to extend all the benefits of categorical programs to anyone who now comes in under this umbrella. That's one example of the danger of euphemistic thinking. There are many more.

Let me give you an example of how these dynamics work. Race is an invention, a construct. "Race" never existed in human history until the colonial period. There was never "races". Obviously, people could observe physical differences among people. But never in human history did they believe they were looking at different species or different races. But that became necessary with the expansion of a colonial empire in Europe. And again, I'm not going through this simply to do name calling. I'm saying that if we intend to deal with the problems we have in 1978, we have to understand where they came from. When the residuals of that system continue to work, then we have to know what it is that we're working on. For example, we have "race relations" training without "races". You have to put "race" on your drivers license. It doesn't exist. Arthur Jensen does studies of the differences between IQs of the "races" and I don't know how he gets his samples. Biologists cannot give you a

description that everyone agrees on that, scientifically, will allow people to be placed in "racial groups".

Ashley Montague demolished the argument with his book The Fallacy of Race: Mans Most Dangerous Myth. Jacque Barzun demolished the myth; Ruth Benedict demolished the myth. Only the people who need to believe in it are still stuck with the term. It is so imbedded in our psyche that we can't even think without it. It's an invention for oppression. It was a marker and had all kinds of funny things associated with it. For example, you could be one "race" in America and another "race" in South Africa. That didn't bother some scientists.

So once you have race, the natural thing to do is to find out which one is on top. So you rank them and then racism begins. You can't have racism until you conceive a race. You also get "proracism". I'd like to tell you what I think racism is, at least one aspect of it, and proracism. Racism is a mental illness! I'm not being cute with the words. When I say mental illness, I'm going to give you specific definitions of racist behavior which qualify it as a mental illness. Any of the things that I'm going to say about racism, if exhibited by an individual, would be cause for their institutionalism. But when exhibited by a culture, we simply call that "normal".

First, the symptoms of this mental illness are perceptual distortion; that is to say looking at something and not seeing it as it really is, but distorting it. Secondly, denial of reality. Looking at something squarely and saying it isn't there. For example (I have a lot of African history examples because I do a lot of work in that area), one of the permeating examples of denial of reality is to look King Tut in the face and call him white, or to look at his mother or his father, (we have their mummies) and say that he is "white". It doesn't make any difference to me if he is or he isn't except that some people have said, because he's white, therefore, Blacks are inferior. Well once that gets put on the table then I get interested in the question. So then I begin to look. I have done a slide show of all the Egyptian pharaohs. I've lined them up in sequence and put them in family portraits, etc. and their pictures don't tell the same story that the Egyptologists tell. Denial of reality. "Egypt is not in Africa". You know teachers all over the country are teaching that. They actually have excised Egypt and moved it. Its the biggest removal job I've ever seen off the continent of Africa. Conceptually, that's where it is and people teach that. Therefore, of course, Black people are "moved out of Egypt" after they "moved Egypt up to Europe". It used to be in Asia you know, but they moved it over to Europe. This is the kind of thing I'm talking about. That's racism. That's perceptual distortion; denial of reality.

Projection of blame or blaming the victim. "You hit my fist with your face." "Why don't you get off the floor out from under my foot." Blame the victim. Most of what we do is victim analysis. As soon as we have a new problem, let the riots start in Minneapolis tomorrow, and we'll all be pouring over the debris to examine the victim.

Delusions of grandeur, a belief in white supremacy. Now we don't say that the way we used to say it. This is what I mean by low intensity system. There is a candidate for Governor, I understand, in Georgia I believe, that was campaigning on the platform again. Most people don't say that out loud. There are new ways of saying that. We have IQ tests that will say it for us. Delusions of grandeur.

Phobic reactions to differences. Fear of difference. Inability to associate with people who are different. So if you have perceptual distortion, denial of reality, projection of blame, delusions of grandeur, phobic reactions to differences, those are symptoms of mental conditions which qualify as a mental illness. I'm seeing all of that taking place after the system of oppression is established as a defense to keep the system going.

An example under oppression of miseducation at work. The education system itself has to produce mental illness. It also has to produce those things in the list that I gave to you. How does an education system do that? Carter Woodson in 1933 wrote a book called The Miseducation of the Negro. If you read that book along with John Dewey (John Dewey was good in what he did. The problem was he left out a lot), doesn't it seem strange to you that at the time many of our outstanding philosophers were writing, one of the main things in the culture was oppression, and yet you can't pick up a philosophy book on the philosophy of education that deals systematically with oppression? There is no philosophy to explain or handle that. What was happening? Were they not seeing it? Was it not important? Carter Woodson was talking about that in 1933.

How does some of that miseducation occur? First it appears through the destruction of information. Most of us don't believe that happens--that people actually destroy information. Thats been going on throughout history. The Library of Alexandria, which had half a million papyrus scrolls, was destroyed in 500 B.C. by the Persians; destroyed in 58 B.C. by Julius Caesar (they say accidentally); it was destroyed in 323 A.D. with specific purposes to keep Africans from getting an education in their own institutions. The things were brought right out in the middle of the court and burned. The library of Timbuktu was destroyed. When Cortez hit New Mexico, the

first thing he did was to pull out all the things that could be burned and burn them. There are stories by missionaries of what took place at that time, where people were sitting down crying because they knew what was in the books. They saw their whole history destroyed before them. People even got together and buried their pyramids to keep them from being destroyed as a way to hang on to their culture, because that information would disprove what Louis Terman and other people would later say about the mentality of Indians who "could not be taught to be citizens". So you had to destroy evidence that there was a civilization where there had been citizens. And its now "genetic".

You have to control information through copyrights and a lot of other ways. You even have to make up information, fabricate information, invent things that never happened. And then there is the control of the dissemination of information. A couple of examples, Roots, I mention this because so many human relations people have purchased the film and in trying to do a good job are trying to make that movie available to students. I'm not saying don't do that, but I have a problem with the film being used unintelligently. That film can be used, but there are some very important things about it. For example, it was advertised as a "triumph" of an "American family". The triumph of an American family? But it ends just before Jim Crow begins. If that American family triumphed (in other words, that's how we got over oppression), then how can we explain that it ends when oppression actually began in America. A few years after that movie ended, we have the hangings, we had the segregation of schools, the disenfranchisement of voters, and the Jim Crow laws. That's a triumph?

Roots, the film, was done by a white person. By itself that doesn't necessarily mean anything, except that if its a "triumph" you would think that by now we would have at least a few examples of films that are done independently by the people who are talking about themselves. I'm not going to make a big thing of that except for the fact that in doing that film, there were significant departures from the book. That's what I would be doing in teaching human relations. I would be teaching the difference between the book and the film. For example, the book spends almost a third of its time in Africa. The film only spends a minimum of its time in Africa. Thats a very important time. Haley did not leave out the empire of Mali at its height. Its in the book, but it really isn't in the film. It looks as if Africans were really on their way from just coming out of the trees into these villages and they hadn't really quite made it, but that's simply not true. Haley's village, Jophur in Gambia, is on the coast which was at the "boonies" of the Mali empire. Timbuktu was the center, way back over in the middle of the Mali empire. The movie gives an exactly opposite impression. But more important than that, there were significant

changes from the book to the film. The book was already cut before it was published. When Kizzy is being taken away on this wagon, in the film the mother runs after the wagon and the father holds the mother back to keep her from running after her daughter. That's a very touching scene. The only problem is Haley didn't write it that way. Haley wrote it with the father running after the wagon and being beaten unconscious when he could not rescue his daughter, which would have been the only real act of resistance that Kunta Kinte displayed in his whole life. Why did they change that scene if they decided to show it at all? Okay, I can't imagine that Haley would have done that. There were only two messages that I got out of Roots. One is that resistance never pays. Kunta Kinte couldn't even escape efficiently. Every time he tried he was a failure at escaping. Secondly, no matter how bad things were they're getting better, and better, and better. I see nothing inspirational for African-Americans in the story of Kunta Kinte.

(Question: Do you mean he didn't have any control over the film then?) I don't know. But I'm just making the observation of the comparison of the two. I have some problems with the book, too. If you really know African history you'll know it hasn't even been told by Haley.

Similarly, in the film King we had the same thing again. Here is another white writer writing African-American history and changing it. I understand the person who wrote King didn't like Abernathy, so Abernathy is written out of the film. He's not there, he was there, but he's not there in the film. We say, "Oh thats just fiction, its not really true, its not a documentary, its just an artist's conception". But that's how we teach the population falsehood. Fictional biography is a way of not dealing with the truth. For example, The Autiobiography of Malcolm X is taught in schools, but not Malcolm's speeches. The difference between those two to me is so glaring that all the cute stories about what happened to him when he was a boy were interesting, but that wasn't the issue in the nation. His issue in the nation was what he had to say about the conditions. One of the things that's always apparent to me as I listen to people who treat folk like Malcolm, Garvey, King, Zappata, Simon Bolivar, is that we never really hear what they said. We see their pictures and we get their autobiography, but never their message!

The colonial situation depends upon a system that maintains privilege, and profit for the dominating group. A system has to be built to keep that intact. For example, educate a population in South Africa to a high school level, and all those Blacks would change the politics of South Africa overnight. So, consequently, you must have scholarly rationales to explain why that can't happen, that's why you have as much IQ testing going on in South Africa as you do here. Standardized testing is big business in South Africa, believe it or not. The same ones that we use here are used there, and with the same consequences.

You must make the colonized a dependent person. That's why much of our social welfare system is designed to continue dependent behavior, not independent behavior. Relationships must be standardized almost to the caste level. There has to be the production of a whole bunch of myths to legitimize what's taking place. "The victim loves me." Remember back in the 50's? I happen to be one of those people they were talking about from the 40's who loved the people who were keeping me from going to good schools; who loved the people who kept my dad from getting the job he deserved; who loved the people who kept me from living in the kind of house I wanted; that's what the politician would say. "Our Negroes love us." "They understand us and we understand them, but its these outside people who come in and stir up trouble." You see what I mean. So the myth has to be that, "the victim loves me". That's why we always demand comedy from the victim.

For example, we have to have Fred Sanford, we have to have Grady on Sanford, we have to have JJ, we have to have Nipsy Russell; we have to have, "lots of teeth" as one article said, so that we know that "the victim loves us". It's the "white man's burden". "It's our responsibility". "It's something we have to bear". We don't want to do this." "We don't want to be here, but it's our burden that we have to carry to civilize the world", or we're bringing to them the "benefits of civilization". Dole went to Hawaii and brought the "benefits of civilization". He left them and took the fruits of civilization. "We have to teach them to govern themselves". "If we left, things would be complete, utter chaos". That's why history is important--the history that says there was nothing in operation before colonizers arrived. In fact, there were huge nation states that existed before any colonial power got into many parts of the world-actually existed--knowledge of them had to be destroyed. And then scholars think that theory and practice can be separated. Naturally, once we separate we always have to rank--that theory is better than practice--and theory is where scholars dwell. So we no longer have to be responsible for what our theory means in practice, and especially, we do not have to confront this truth that I'm trying to present to you right now. And I think that's a pseudodualism, for scholars to believe their best work is in building models that don't apply to anything. "I'm just a theoretician--you are going to have to figure out how this works."

Functional roles in the game of oppression must be examined. One of the things I'm disturbed about is the way we keep talking about the oppressive system and we keep looking and saying, "the White male, the White male, the White male." You see, the White male is a beneficiary of the oppressive system that we have right now. In many ways, some White males are also the victims of the same system. Let me give you an illustration that I steal from Bob Williams who wrote the Bitch Test. He's talking about testing.

He says that in testing there are people who, if you think of it as a game, there are people who design the game, there are people who are advocates for the game, there are people who deal the game, and then there are people who are pawns in the game. Now a lot of people are confused about where they are in that. A lot of people don't even know the games run that way. Think of Las Vegas. There are people who design the games, there are people who advocate the games, there are people who deal in the game, and there are the people who are the pawns in the game. Each one of those is in a different position with respect to the others. Now just because white males happen to be on the "winning side", in some part, doesn't deny the fact that even in doing that there are these four levels. There are people who are simply advocates for these oppressive systems and they don't even know what the system is. There are people who are dealers in the system and they don't even know what the advocates or the systems are about. And there are people who are victims of that same system but the ideology that they carry in their heads won't even permit them to see themselves as victim because they get a few little rewards here and there. So I think its very important that we not simply separate people into the White male group, the White female group, the Black group, etc. and that we really truly understand the dynamics of oppression, which keeps an awful lot of people oppressed more than they would care to believe.

Educational outcomes, then, under colonization are these: If we have a colonial system in operation for both the person who is colonized and the person who is a colonizer these are the outcomes of education. This is very important because many people say there is a sickness in the poverty areas. That's true. But its also true that the people who oppressed them are pathological because pathology cannot exist in one part of town without existing in both parts of town. We get health when all of us are healthy. Here is the kind of sickness that we get if we run two separate systems of education as we do.

Alienation, general alienation from who we are and, especially, alienation from the truth. We cannot look at truth. You take your life into your own hands in South Africa just for publishing the truth. You have to invent a life, a way of talking, thinking, and behaving that doesn't let anybody know that you know the truth, because it can be costly. That's alienation and that's sickness. Similarly, there is discontinuity. If you fabricate things you cannot experience the true continuity that you have. In other words, you can't experience historical continuity. You cannot have a sense of where you started in the very beginning and how you got to the present. The outcome is mental bondage. That is to say "conceptual incarceration". The inability to quit thinking the way we think. The inability to think about the way we think

as a way of thinking. In other words, once we get something in our head, like "race" we can't even raise questions about the assumptions of the construct, let alone the construct itself. That's mental bondage--that's one of the outcomes of colonial education. That's why anyone who sits in a community that's all white and says, "we don't need human relations education or multicultural education because we don't have any minorities", is only exhibiting that exact mental bondage that I was trying to describe.

Let me see if I can conclude by giving you some examples of how this might be applied to a couple of areas in some of the things we talk about in human relations and what educators ought to be doing about it, applying the colonial model. "Integration is a goal of education". This is where I have a lot of problems. I understand desegregation, but do not, I confess to you, understand "integration". I understand that discrimination should in no way be imposed upon people. I do not understand integration as a pedagogy. I'm willing to try to understand integration as a pedagogy, but right now all that integration means for most people is mixing bodies. So when people talk about a "quality education", what they mean is proportional body mix. Sometimes when I talk to Black people about quality education it comes out to the effect that, whatever White people have is a quality education. Now my problem is this. If you get all the bodies mixed and everyone has equal access to a racist education, is that a quality education? Think about it for a minute. In other words, it seems to me that quality education refers to the content of the experience more than to the juxtaposition of the people. I don't know what all of that means for planning, but I know it hasn't been thought out. In 20 years since '54 we have had no pedagogy for integration. We have had only legal mandates to which we must respond. I think that that is terrible. If we wanted integration, there are ways to achieve it, easy ways to achieve it. For example, we've dealt with the housing question already. We could make that work. We could make equal employment opportunity work. There are a lot of things that we could do that would still allow people to draw on the rich cultural resource that they have. What does pedagogy have to say about the destruction of communities?

If you really mean to have integration as a goal of education, then you have to talk about it in a consistent way across the board. You have to break up Utah. Thats a whole Mormon state. You have to break up all the Catholic schools. In other words, our categories and numbers must identify every cultural group in America of any kind. Then let that be the base upon which we conduct our mathematics if you really mean integration. But if all you mean is taking poor blacks and poor whites who can't get out of the arena within which you're going to do the mixing and thats integration, then we're fooling ourselves. We're not saying that what we want

in America is one culture and one education. We're saying that within the public domain we would do a few things that resemble a response to the segregation that used to occur. I don't think we have thought this thing out well enough. I don't see many people playing with it at all, so I'm concerned.

How do we handle ethnic studies? It seems to me that while we're thinking about this colonial model, it should be very clear why ethnic studies are necessary except I don't like to call them ethnic studies, I like to call them truth studies. They are for academic self-defense. Frequently, the enemies of a people have been in the citadels of higher education. "Academic repair"--we have to fix the knowledge base that we're living with. We have to purge our whole language of concepts with "race", for example: concepts like "civilization", concepts like "savage". Did you know the savage never existed? Savagism and Civilization is a study on why White America needed savages. They weren't savage before Europeans knew them.

Teacher competence. What is a competent teacher? Certainly, they are not the ones who score high on the NTE. We get into weird situations where, for example, in Adair County, Oklahoma, they tell me that exactly the reverse of what used to be is happening with Cherokee Indian education. Around the eraly 1900s, Cherokees ran their own schools and they sent their kids to some of the finest schools in the country. They had something like a 98% literacy rate. They were running bilingual newspapers until the federal government took over. Now they have one of the lowest literacy rates in the nation, in the same county, the same people. What is teacher competence--high NTE scores. Why is is that we're unable to take what I just said and look at it and then look at the NTE. Thats an example of perceptual distortion, denial of reality, delusions of grandeur, projection of blame and phobic reactions to differences. Our target of the strategy for human relations education has to be both the colonizer and the colonized, not one, but both. Don't give up on the one we're looking at, but we have to look at them in different ways. We also have to look at the people who are doing things to other people, people who need to be oppressors or who are blind to oppression.

This model means that we're going to have to take another look at our perspective on the different forms of oppression. All oppression is evil. But all oppression is not the same. Sexism and racism are not the same forms of oppression nor is handicappism. For example, I don't know that people have gone out and lynched other people just because they were in wheel chairs or murdered people just because they were women. Where they have murdered, lynched, or segregated; they did so because people were black, brown, or otherwise.

All oppression is bad. All oppression is not the same. Sexism and handicappism and any other kind of ism in my book is simply a fallout from the habits of thinking that are initiated under justification for racism. Once you begin to allow the kind of thinking that supports racism, many others will follow from that. I don't mean they're less important. The reason I say that is that by the time you get through identifying all the "isms", pretty soon no one has any problems. One guy in San Francisco said, "Well, after all, White males are the minority in San Francisco". Which is true numerically only. That's the smallest group of all the big groups there. So, "we all have problems". By and by everything will be done because of the inappropriate focus on what the real problem is--the inappropriate analysis of the dynamics and the mechanisms of oppression.

It seems to me our response ought to be as follows: the human relations educator and other educators ought to respond to what I'm talking about in a number of ways. First, we need to be very clear in our own thinking about whether we're dealing with a high intensity or low intensity system or no intensity system. That's very important, for this reason. Most people will look at our system and not see it to be intense at all. It's infinitely harder to work in a low intensity system than it is to work in a high intensity system where everyone can see their target. This is what happened in television. You can show Bull Connors with the police dogs and all the innocent people and churches being bombed and stuff like that. You could always get people to identify who the enemy was and strategies could be developed to attack that problem. But when the enemy goes underground, then its hard to get people to admit that there is an enemy. For example, one of the things that Price Cobb, who co-authored Black Rage, says is that in his work with businesses trying to reduce racism in business, "the first problem I have and the biggest problem I have is to get the people who I'm working with to admit that racism exists." To confront racism. If I can get that one solved, everything else is downhill thereafter. That's an example of how hard it is to work in a low intensity system.

We have to make a conscious choice as human relations educators to deal with the whole system even though our little part may not be dealing with the whole system. Conceptually, we have to imagine the entire system of oppression and how its working so that we can select and prioritize and specifically target our activities because we have scarce resources. Some of the things that we do under the banner of human relations are good and interesting to do, but it seems to me, are totally irrelevant to do in light of some of the things that we have before us. In part, this is because we don't have an imagination about how the whole system works. We need a map--a conceptual scheme of what's going on so that we can organize and focus our efforts. We need to keep all the targets for action

in clear focus at all times. One of the problems with our sloppy use of language is that the targets get out of the kilter and we're not sure about what we're talking about. For example, the word "minority" meant one thing 10 years ago and it means something else today. So the targets have actually changed but we think we're still dealing with "minority". What I'm saying is that our thinking hasn't caught up with what we're doing.

We need to select strategies based upon the theory of oppression, that is directed toward eradicating causes not symptoms. Most of what we do is the other way around--dealing with symptoms not causes. Thats why so much of our work goes into changing stereotypes. If you paint half the pictures in the book black, if you have more women dressed up in clothes that are not traditionally women, you can actually work on the stereotype. You can get a whole series of books. The thing that caused the stereotype in the first place hasn't even been imagined and so it will pop up in some other place, and you still have that to deal with. We should be working on the causes and I think that requires a theory of why oppression is occurring. We have to have a conscious attempt all the time. We ought to have meetings on it once a week to find out, "Are we using euphemisms? Are we calling a spade a spade?" No pun intended.

We have to deal more as human relations people with the content of the experience and less with the process of the experience. An example of that is the experience that we had with the presentation of Voices the other night. What I want to say about that is not that you shouldn't use Voices. But if you use Voices, I hope you have done your homework and that you know how to use Voices. I kept waiting during that presentation for the other shoe to drop, and it never dropped. All I got was a repeat of "Butter Beans". I have a problem with Butter Beans because I had that all the way through junior high school. I would teach something with Voices and I wouldn't use it if I wasn't ready to teach this. If you're not ready to teach the conscious attempt to destroy the black male, then don't use Voices in your human relations program. Its all on stage there. "Butter Beans" never existed in the black community. I haven't seen anybody who has ever seen a man behave that way except on a stage. That man was created out of somebody else's needs which is really the psychological spoor of white mentality. It had nothing to do with black reality at all. So if you're ready to teach that, use Voices. But if you're not, leave it alone. If you're ready to teach black female relationships and what oppression does to that, then use Voices, otherwise leave it alone. If you're ready to teach what is being done to the black aged, the disrespect for the black, here's a man who knew everything there was to know about black music, had been a performer, the way he was treated in that skit of comedy as if his knowledge meant nothing, etc. indicated the emerging disrespect

of the aged. Unless you're ready to deal with that, don't use it. The perversion of talent--the fact that in order to even show talent, people had to change from who they were into somebody else just to be able to sing; that says something about the oppressive system. That doesn't say anything about those people. The exploitation of Black creativity. If you're ready to teach that, then use Voices. There are people who have made and continue to make money off the creativity of Blacks, particularly in the arts, particularly in music. That is to say many a song writer has died poor in Black communities while the song has made millions for other people, like Elvis Presley, like Tom Jones, like other people who sit down and learn all these things. If you're going to deal with that then show Voices, if you're not, then leave it alone. I'm not trying to tell you to use Voices, but what I'm trying to do is to give an illustration. I think some of what was happening there was not being perceived by the group. I think everybody has good intentions, etc. and you did see talented people perform. Stefen Fetchit was talented. He was a number one talent. That's why he was so dangerous because he indelibly imbedded in the minds of white America who Black America was. Just as JJ is doing that now, just as Fred Sanford and Grady and John Amos; just as almost all the major TV presentations are doing that now. We do not have the analytical tools to deal with that. These negative images are actually recolonizing our mind. We don't have to have the same thing happen as before as long as we control the media in making presentations about the lives of people who are supposed to be dominated. Unless you're ready to teach the White need for Black clowns and buffoons, don't use Voices.

William Marshall said that Hollywood put out the word that there would be nothing but clowns, nothing but comedy for Black people this year. William Marshall happened to be one of the finest actors that Hollywood has produced and all the roles he could get last year was "Blacula". When Roots came up one of the things that happened is they overlooked all the good Black actors except LeVar Burton. Joh Amos--I spent four years getting used to John Amos as an ineffectual welfare father and you put him in my face and expect me to believe that that's Kunta Kinte, an African chieftain. What am I supposed to believe? Marshall would have done that role proud. He even made <u>Blacula</u> into a good movie. What's the man's name who did Chicken George? I have problems with Ben Vereen. He's running around the nation getting standing ovations for dealing as Burt Williams in the same way that Voices is doing and nobody is explaining. "Why Burt Williams?" No art is just art unless you are ready to deal with the squelching of Black anger, which has to be manifested as disguised form. So, in other words, it takes a lot of homework to do what we have to do. That is, that's one of the problems I have with much of the human relations stuff. We don't want to do that hard work. We don't want to require the people that we're working with to do

the hard work. In order to deal with what I'm talking about, its going to take a lot of work on content.

I finally close with the criteria for quality education in a decolonized education system, and I have five criteria. The first one oddly enough is truth. All you have to do is tell the truth. You don't have to give me black education, brown education or white education, if you give me true education. Truth will pluralize your world. Truth will not let a man (who is Dean of Creative Arts and Humanities; who claims to be a Shakespearean expert) present himself as an expert having received a "quality education" when he doesn't even know that Ira Aldrige was one of the greatest Shakespearan actors that ever existed in the 1800s. A Black man played Othello, but he also played King Lear, also played Shylock in white face, with black hands. Continuity is another criterion of quality education. A person must experience himself as continuous. This is not a put down of anyone's culture. Its simply a recognition of what's real and what's true. Its not necessary to deny someone else's reality in order to affirm your own. Self-determination. Look at education right now and one of the things that you'll see is we are one of the agents of the destruction of the capacity of communities to help themselves because what we impose upon them are systems which require their dependence upon outsiders. We do not support self-determination. Self-knowledge. No knowledge is better than self-knowledge and self-knowledge allows for other knowledge. In other words, people shouldn't be buried in self-knowledge, but they should have self-knowldge because understanding self is possible for them to understand other people. If you start understanding other people and never have a sense of self you cannot be said to have the quality education. And finally, a criterion for quality education is whether it results in liberation or not. Some education is designed at the outset not to be liberating. Behavior modification has as its goal to control people. We want to drug people as they do in schools when children do whatever annoys adults. We have a name for that called "hyperactivity" and "minimal brain dysfunction" because we don't believe in liberation, and I don't mean "license". I mean the knowledge and the capacity to choose and to create. These are the kinds of things that represent quality education -- truth, continuity, self-determination, self-knowledge, liberation. If we're going to get all of that, it seems to me we have a whole lot of homework to do.

Thank you.

References

Barzun, Jaques. Race: A study in superstition. New York: Harper & Row, 1965. (first published 1937)

Benedict, Ruth. Race, Science and Politics. New York: Viking Press, 1943.

Biddis, M. Father of Racist Ideology: The social and political thought of Count Gobineau. New York: Weinright and Talley, 1970.

Blyden, Edward W. Christianity, Islam, and the Negro. London: Edinburgh University Press, 1967. (first published 1887)

Carnoy, M. Education as Cultural Imperialism. New York: McKay, 1974.

Chase, Allen. The Legacy of Malthus: The social costs of the new scientific racism. New York: A. Knoph, 1977.

Cox, George. African Empires and Civilizations. Washington, D.C.: African Heritage Studies Publishers, 1974.

Diop, C. A. The Cultural Unity of Black Africa. Chicago: Third World Press, 1978.

Eaton, C. The Freedom of Thought Struggle in the Old South. New York: Harper Torchbook, 1964.

Fanon, F. A Dying Colonialism. New York: Evergreen, 1965.

Fanon, F. Black Skin White Masks. New York: Grove, 1967.

Friere, Paulo. Education for Critical Consciousness. New York: Seabury, 19

Hall, E. T. Beyond Culture. New York: Anchor, 1977.

Hilliard, A. "Equal Education Opportunity and Quality Education", Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 9, 2, 1978, pp. 110-126.

Hilliard, A. "The Education of 'Inner-City' Children" in Demythologizing the Inner City Child. R.C. Granger and J. Young (Eds.), Washington, D.C.: National Association for the Education of Young Children, 1976.

Hodge, J., Struckman, D. K. and Frost, L. D. Cultural Bases for Racism and Group Oppression: An examination of traditional "Western" Concepts, Values, and Institutional Structures which support racism, sexism and elitism. Berkeley: Two Riders Press, 1975.

James, George G. M. Stolen Legacy. San Francisco: Julian Richardson, 1976.

King, Kenneth J. Pan Africanism and Education: A Study of Race, Philanthropy and Education in the Southern States of America and East Africa. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.

Memmi, Albert. The Colonizer and the Colonized. Boston: Beacon Press, 1968.

Montagu, A. The Concept of Race. New York: Collier, 1964.

Montagu, A. Man's Most Dangerous Myth: The Fallacy of Race. New York: Oxford University Press, 1974.

Pearce, R. H. Savagism and Civilization. Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1965.

Rodney, Walter. How Europe Underdeveloped Africa. Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press, 1974.

Samkange, S. Origins of Rhodesia. New York: Praeger, 1969.

Stanton, W. The Leopard's Spots: Scientific Attitudes Towards Race in America 1815-59. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.

Tabata, I. B. Education for Barbarism in South Africa: Bantu (Apartheid) Education. London: Pall Mall Press, 1960.

Thomas A. and S. Sillen. Racism and Psychiatry. New York: Brunner Mazel, 1972.

Weinreich, M. Hitler's Professors: The part of scholarship in Germany's Crimes Against the Jewish People. New York: YIVO, 1949.

Woodson, Carter G. Miseducation of the Negro. Washington, D. C.: Associated Publishers, 1969. (first published 1933)

Williams, Chancellor. The Destruction of Black Civilization. Chicago: Third World Press, 1974.